

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the art cited by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed March 22, 2006. Claims 1–7, 11, 14 and 26-30 remain pending in this application. No claims have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-7, 11, 14, and 26-30 in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1–7, 11, 14 and 26-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0047276 to Eisenhart. The rejection is respectfully traversed as set out more fully below.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a method including matching the resource provider according to a record of the resource provider with other certified resource providers having a record saved in an electronic hub system. Matching the resource provider includes implementing matches and business plans for the certified resource provider based on similarities to business models of the other certified resource providers. The method also recites examining multiple items of a resource provider to certify the resource provider as being able to provide at least one selected from the group consisting of capital, land, building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans.

Eisenhart fails to disclose or suggest implementing matches **and** business plans for the certified resource provider based on similarities to business models of the other certified resource providers. Eisenhart does not disclose providing business plans to the user and, moreover, providing business plans based on similarities to the business models of the other providers. Furthermore, no motivation is provided to modify the system in Eisenhart to provide business plans to members. Rather, the objective of the system disclosed in Eisenhart is to facilitate the exchange of technology between a Supplier and a Buyer.

In addition, Eisenhart does not disclose or suggest examining multiple items of the resource provider to certify the resource provider as being able to provide at least one selected from the group consisting of capital, land, building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans. Eisenhart discloses qualifying a member

by "verifying the contact information for a potential member 305 or completing a financial transaction." See paragraph [0045]. Eisenhart does not disclose or suggest the type of financial transaction or how the financial transaction affects qualification. The transaction, for example, may merely be payment of a membership fee. Eisenhart does not enable the act of certifying the ability of a resource provider to provide one of the resources in the recited group, including capital.

Furthermore, according to the disclosure referencing FIG. 7A, the technology exchange system analyzes the registration data to verify the qualifications of a potential member 305. See paragraph [0105]. The term "qualifications" is not defined in Eisenhart. However, Eisenhart does provide examples of registration data, such as name, company affiliation, electronic mail address, and anonymous login name. See *id.* At no point does Eisenhart disclose how such submissions would enable the system to certify the ability of a resource provider to provide a particular resource.

Moreover, the only disclosure of certification in Eisenhart is the enablement of users to certify the technology exchange itself by associating digital notarization for each exchange with a Supplier. See paragraph [0015].

For at least these reasons, Eisenhart would not lead a person having skill in the art to the invention of claim 1. Claims 2–7, 11, and 14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 2-7, 11, and 14 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 26 recites, in part, a system including an electronic hub configured to cooperate with a data storage device to match a resource provider according to a record of the resource provider with other certified resource providers having a record saved in a data storage device. Matching the resource provider includes implementing matches and business plans for the certified resource provider according to similarities to business models of said other certified resource providers. The hub also cooperates with the storage device to examine multiple items of the resource provider to certify the resource provider as being able to provide at least one selected from the group consisting of capital, land, building rental, management groups, regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans.

Applicants assert Eisenhart would not lead a person having skill in the art to the invention of claim 26 for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 26-30 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

All points raised by the Examiner have now been addressed, and the claims are in condition for favorable consideration. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300



Brian H. Batzli
Reg. No. 32,960
BHB/JKS:bog

Date June 22, 2006

